

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 21 and 22 have been amended. Claims 24-25 are newly added.

In the last Official Action, all claims were rejected as either anticipated or obvious in view of Buck, O'Neil and/or Ainsbury. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant maintains that none of the claims in the present application are shown or suggested by the cited references.

I. Claims 1, 21 and 22 Are Not Taught By Buck

Claims 1, 21 and 22 have been amended to clarify that (i) the subscriber recited in the claims is different from one of the Web site operators that provides the content that is analyzed by the present invention, and (ii) the list of content compiled for the subscriber in, for example, step (d) of claims 1 and 21, is compiled based only on the recited relevance and content determinations. In contrast to the present invention, the subscribers in Buck are the content providers, and the "compiled list" in Buck is based on factors other than relevance/content determinations, i.e., in Buck the compiled list is based on a dollar amount paid by the content provider to the searching service. Thus, claims 1, 21 and 22 are clearly not taught by Buck. Moreover, it bears noting that the value of the results returned to the subscriber in Applicant's invention would be diminished if they were influenced by a paid placement from a content provider, as such influence from a content provider would weaken the credibility of Applicant's service to subscribers. Accordingly, the Examiner rejection of claims 1, 21 and 22 as anticipated by Buck should be withdrawn.

II. Claim 23 Is Not Taught By O'Neil

Turning now to pending claim 23, this claim stands rejected for anticipation in view of the O'Neil reference. Applicant respectfully submits that several aspects of claim 23 are not shown by O'Neil. First, with respect to the limitation stating "wherein said processor selects a plurality of Web sites relating to a category to which the specified subject relates," the Examiner has cited to col. 1, lines 30-50 of O'Neil which state as follows:

After logging on to a data network, such as the Internet, a subscriber may visit various web sites hosted by any number of information providers. As the user visits the various web sites, the call spawning device monitors actions of the subscriber and initiate (or spawn) a call to appropriate parties based on a navigational history of the subscriber. The call spawning device may spawn the call without explicit request by the subscriber based on its analysis of the navigational history. The analysis may be performed using expert systems, for example.

In addition, the call spawning system may include a call coordination device that generates preamble information. The preamble information is provided to the called party (e.g., an operation or another appropriate party) regarding the subject matter of interest to the subscriber so that the called party may be briefed and be enabled to provide help needed by the subscriber. Thus, the preamble information primes the called party.

In this way, the call spawning system enables the subscriber to take advantage of personal interaction features more effectively.

It is respectfully submitted that the above cited passage from O'Neil does not disclose the selection of a plurality of Web sites relating to a specified category by a processor, as required by claim 23. In the passage above, no Web site is selected by a processor based on a category or subject -- rather, a call is spawned based on the navigational history of a subscriber. Spawning a call is clearly different from the Web site selection, as recited in claim 23. Moreover, in O'Neil the Web sites are selected by the subscriber – rather than a processor, as set forth in claim 23. Thus, O'Neil does not anticipate claim 23.

Referring again to pending claim 23, and specifically the limitation that states “wherein said processor determines the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words relating to the specified subject,” the Examiner has cited to col. 6, lines 49-65, col. 12, lines 14-30 and col. 14, lines 19-30 of O’Neil, which read as follows:

When the preamble information is generated, the controller 120 may organize the preamble information in an appropriate format. For example, the controller 120 may create a summary display similar to a table of contents using predetermined standardized headings such as user name, user interest, user purchasing range, etc. In this way, the call assistance device 400 may receive the preamble information in such form that allows efficient interaction with the user. For example, an operator may be provided personal information regarding the user immediately by simply scanning the summary display and be able to greet the user personally by name, for example. Then, as the interaction progresses, the operator may immediately access information depending on the progress of the conversation by simply scanning the summary and retrieving by hyperlink, for example, only the information that is relevant based on the substance of the conversation.

* * *

The call spawning device 800 may also offer advice/assistance to the subscriber for other circumstances than those described above. For example, if the subscriber searches for a specific article using one of the available search engines, and the author of the article is unavailable for conversation, the cost spawning device 800 may spawn a connection between the subscriber and the author for a real time “live” discussion. If the cost spawning device 800 detects that the subscriber is having difficulty in using the browser, for example, the cost spawning device 800 may either offer immediate assistance via a message or spawn a call between the subscriber and the call assistant familiar with the browser to help resolve the difficulty. Thus, the cost spawning device 800 may serve as a help enabler for any subject matter for which there is an available expert.

* * *

In step 7008, the controller records the URL of the web site in which the subscriber made the selection and goes to step 7014. In step 7014, the controller 802 determines whether the selection contains tracking code. If the selection contains tracking code, the controller 802 goes to step 7018; otherwise, the controller 802 goes to step 7012. In step 7012, the controller 802 generates the tracking code by using various schemes such

as identifying combinations of words to select standardized keywords and record other information such as a web page location within the web site as well as the selection within the web page and then goes to step 7018.

The above cited passages from O'Neil fail to teach "determin[ing] [with a processor] the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words relating to the specified subject," as set forth in claim 23. The only items arguably "scanned" for by a processor in O'Neil above are tracking codes – which are not the same as "words relating to the specified subject," as recited in the claim. For this additional reason, it is respectfully submitted that O'Neil does not anticipate claim 23.

Referring still to claim 23, and specifically to the limitation stating "wherein said processor determines the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words indicating content type," the Examiner has cited to col. 12, lines 39-49 and col. 13, lines 1-26 of O'Neil which state as follows:

When the subscriber logs on to the data network 302, the user device 200 may send a message to the cost spawning device 800 to indicate that the cost spawning support processes should be started for the subscriber. The controller 802 may retrieve from the database 806 the subscriber profile and history information similar to the information stored in the database 600 as shown in Fig. 10. However, the information stored in the database 806 is not restricted to a single Web site. The controller 802 opens an action history file for the subscriber and tracks the subscriber's actions on the data network 302 by storing shadow data of each selected item.

* * *

... For example, if the shadow data are encoded with keywords that distill the essence of each selection, then combinations of keywords may indicate interest, motivation, and etc. If the subscriber logs on to a home improvement web site having initial keywords of: new, high price and ornamental; and selects light fixtures having keywords of high skill and special equipment; and then selects chandeliers, having keywords of fragile, heavy, 10' ceiling minimum, the expert system 808 may recommend a local electrical contractor that specializes in complex fixture installments as a first choice and a do-it-yourself hardware store as a second choice. The controller 802 may select one of these recommendations by retrieving the subscriber's data network purchase and

account history to discriminate between a wealthy subscriber purchasing a chandelier for a mansion versus a middle class subscriber building a dream house on a shoestring budget, for example. If the latter, the controller 802 may select the do-it-yourself hardware store second choice recommended by the expert system 808, for example.

Alternatively, for example, the expert system 808 could group a list of potential called parties indexed to a list of keywords. For example, the expert system 808 could evaluate the action history file to generate a list of relevant keywords based on a predefined criteria. The relevant keywords could then be compared with the indices of the list to generate a list of potential parties to initiate calls to.

The above-cited passages fail to disclose “determin[ing] the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words indicating content type.” For this further reason, it is respectfully submitted that O’Neil fails to anticipate claim 23, and the Examiner’s rejection of claim 23 in view of O’Neil should therefore be withdrawn.

III. Claims 7 and 8 Are Not Taught By Buck

Claims 7 and 8 contain a limitation requiring that “the plurality of Web sites is selected based on the frequency with which relevant links have been located in prior iterations¹ of the method.” In rejecting claims 7 and 8, the Examiner cited col. 5, line 55 to col. 6, line 11 of Buck, which reads as follows:

... The search report may rate the listings by a relevancy ranking, computed on the basis of certain relevancy factors selected by the search service. Alternatively, a user BCF@netB can query a category search service (indicated by the numeral 30 in the figure) by categories, and receive listings of sites assigned to those categories. The index and category methods may be combined, as indicated by the bar in the future.

¹ This limitation is supported in the specification at, for example, page 9, line 23 to page 10, line 2 (“Optionally, feedback may be utilized to improve the accuracy or speed of the present method. For example, Web sites whose Web pages consistently fail to generate any hits in step 302 or consistently are categorized as being of an inappropriate content type (such as advertising) may be omitted from subsequent iterations of the present method ...”)

In the present invention, a denominated-value search service (indicated by the numeral 40 in the figure) provides a search report in response to user query in which the listings are ranked by value (\$) as paid by the listing subscriber. The denominated-value ranking may be preceded by an index search 20 and/or category search 30 to locate a subset of targeted or categorized listings. The index or category search is performed on the denominated-value service's database of listings. Each listing includes a title or description of the content of the respective site, a network address at which the site can be accessed on the network, and a denominated value to be paid by the subscriber associated with the site listing while it is maintained on the listing server. As described further below, the denominated-value search report may also be provided to other search services and converted to their rating systems for inclusion in their search reports.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-quoted passage from Buck cited by the Examiner fail to teach or suggest selecting Web sites "based on the frequency with which relevant links have been located in prior iterations of the method," as required by claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7 and 8 are allowable over Buck.²

IV. Claim 11 Is Not Taught By Buck

With respect to pending claim 11, the Examiner has asserted that col. 7, lines 1-14 and col. 9, lines 36-50 of Buck teach the following limitation: "(f) compiling a list of words based on the frequency with which such words have appeared in relevant links located in prior iterations of the method with respect to the same category." Buck, at col. 7, lines 1-14 and col. 9, lines 36-50 reads as follows:

... Referring to Fig. 2B, an interface to the URL position manager is shown displaying a link 41 to change the password or personal information of the subscriber account holder, then a listing of all cites

² In rejecting previous claims 7 and 8, the Examiner also cited to Figures 4A,B, and corresponding text in Buck. Applicant has examined Figures 4A,B of the Buck reference, as well as the text describing the figures, and has been unable to find any feature or passage which relates to the limitations recited in previous claims 7 and 8.

maintained in the account, referenced by the current rank within the particular category/sub-category, the denominated values (fees paid) 43 for the listings, the URL addresses 44 for the cites, the category locations 45, the expiration dates 46 for the cite listings, listings update buttons 47, listings removal buttons 48, and Add New URL Button 49. The Add New URL feature offers the use of the ability to enter a new listing and select the main category and sub-category deemed most appropriate. Once the user completes the necessary information, they are returned to the URL position manager menu at block 22.

* * *

... When a subscriber is ready to make payment of the amount or increment to the subscription fee, the system can automatically execute a credit card payment transaction. Once payment is validated, the system will automatically update the database and begin listing the URLs in the appropriate categories and rankings in response to new search queries. Because the positions of the listings are based on objective criteria, i.e., the denominated value paid by the subscriber, the subscriber can pay an increment to improve a listing's position relative to other URLs within the service, and have the new position immediately reflected in the search database. This eliminates the long delays and arbitrary results offered by conventional search services which must evaluate content or classification before adding or updating a listing.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the above quoted passages of Buck, and is unable to see how this passage in Buck teaches or suggests the step of "compiling a list of words based on the frequency with which such words have appeared in relevant links located in prior iterations of the method with respect to the same category," as set forth in claim 11. In view of this, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is not anticipated by Buck.

V. Claims 12, 13, 24 and 25 Are Not Taught By Buck

With respect to dependent claim 12, the Examiner has asserted that the limitation reciting "wherein the list of relevant Web pages is compiled in step (d) by including only those Web pages that are determined both to be relevant in step (b) and to be of a news content in step (c)," is shown in col. 9, lines 51-67 and col. 12, lines 25-31 and 56-59 of Ainsbury, which read as follows:

... A major step in building a data store filled with inter-related objects from multiple locations, begins by collecting information from relevant sources. However, web pages, documents, and database outputs are too large to be classified accurately with a high degree of confidence and specification. The information platform provides a geometry recognition technology that analyzes multiple sources and recognize particular patterns within each site. A page analyzer scans a source document, e.g., a SEC 10K fiscal-year – revenue filing, and breaks it into blocks and sub-blocks of information, returning the granular pieces for aggregation in the data store 20. With the 10K filing, the page analyzer separates different data types, such as net income, expenses, products lists, company descriptions, and commentary about profits and losses. The page analyzer can recognize and break down input, for example, from HTML pages, text documents, charts, tables, Excel spreadsheets.

* * *

Info Item: The specific data element that is returned to the user upon request for retrieval. Associated with one or more Catalog Collection Items. For each document, there are one or more Info Items that can be collected from it. At a minimum, the full document is an Info Item. Additional, finer grained Info Items can be added which represent extracted portion of a document... Users can use additional data elements to any case either through the system's automated collection or through the system's "source-specific search" feature or from documents they located via browsing.

The above quoted portions of Ainsbury fail to teach or suggest compiling a list of relevant Web pages that includes only Web pages that are both relevant and of a news content type. Ainsbury does not even mention filtering based on news content type. In addition, Ainsbury "breaks down" Web pages into more "granular" objects – rather than compiling a list of Web pages that includes only relevant news content. In view of these differences, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case with obviousness with respect to claim 12, and accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of this claim in view of Ainsbury should be withdrawn. In addition, it is respectfully submitted for the same reason that new claim 24 – which contains the same limitations recited in pending claim 12 – is allowable.

For the reasons set forth immediately above with respect to claim 12, it is also respectfully submitted that the Ainsbury reference fails to teach the limitations of dependent claim 13, and that the Examiner has similarly failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to pending claim 13. In addition, it is respectfully submitted for the same reason that new claim 25 – which contains the same limitations recited in pending claim 13 – is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are allowable over the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee due in connection with this filing to Deposit Account 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel H. Golub
Reg. No. 33,701

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-963-5055

May 12, 2003

CLAIMS WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

1. A method of providing news relating to a specified subject to a subscriber, comprising the steps of:

- (a) selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content providers and relating to a category to which the specified subject relates;
- (b) automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words relating to the specified subject;
- (c) automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning at least one Web page for words indicating content type;
- (d) compiling a list of relevant Web pages based only on the results of steps (b) and (c); and
- (e) providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers.

21. A computer-readable medium tangibly embodying instructions which, when executed by a computer, implement a process comprising the steps of:

- (a) selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content providers and relating to a category to which the specified subject relates;
- (b) automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words relating to the specified subject;
- (c) automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words indicating content type;

(d) compiling a list of relevant Web pages based only on the results of steps (b) and (c); and

(e) providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers.

22. A system for providing news relating to a specified subject to a subscriber, comprising:

means for selecting a plurality of Web sites operated by content providers and relating to a category to which the specified subject relates;

means for automatically determining the relevancy of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words relating to the specified subject;

means for automatically determining the content type of at least one Web page in each selected Web site by scanning for words indicating content type;

means for compiling a list of relevant Web pages based only on the results of the scanning; and

means for providing the compiled list to the subscriber, wherein the subscriber is a party other than one of said content providers.